

**Remarks/Arguments**

In the non-final Office Action dated February 20, 2008, it is noted that: claims 1-17 are pending; claims 1-3 and 10-13 stand rejected; and claims 1, 4-10 and 14-17 are objected to.

Claims 1, 3-10, 13, 14, 16 and 17 have been amended herein to remove reference designators and to clarify the claimed subject matter. The clarifying amendments are based on the original disclosure. No new matter is entered.

***Specification***

Applicant thanks the Examiner for pointing out the suggested guidelines for the specification arrangement. As these are only suggested guidelines applicant declines at this time to amend the specification.

***Claim Objections***

Claims 4-9 and 14-17 have been amended herein to remove multiple dependencies. Claims 1 and 10 has been amended to provide proper antecedence and clarify the claimed subject matter.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits the objections in paragraphs 1-3 of the Office Action should be withdrawn.

***Rejection of Claims 1-3 and 10-13 under 35 U.S.C. §103***

Claims 1-3 and 10-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Akimoto et al., (US 6,876,345) (hereinafter "Akimoto"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 includes the features of: "wherein driver circuitry provides a stepped voltage waveform to the input of the pixel, the stepped voltage waveform being voltage-shifted by the storage capacitor before application to the gate of the drive transistor, and wherein the height of the steps in the stepped voltage waveform is greater than the voltage width of the linear operating region of the drive transistor" (emphasis added).

It is admitted in the Office Action that embodiment 6 of Akimoto fails to teach or suggest the stepped voltage waveform. The Office Action points to embodiment 3 as allegedly showing the stepped voltage waveform.

However, nowhere do Akimoto embodiments 3 or 6 suggest a stepped voltage waveform being voltage-shifted by a storage capacitor. The Office Action points to col. 12, lines 51-60 and Fig. 13, however a review of the cited section, col. 12, fails to find any suggestion that a stepped voltage waveform is voltage-shifted by the storage capacitor. Akimoto only states that the storage capacitor 82 has two input routes, one passing through the signal line 87 and the other passing through the drive signal line 96. Fig. 13 of Akimoto only shows the waveforms of the signal line 87 and the drive signal line 96. There is nothing that suggests applicant's claimed features.

Furthermore, embodiment 6 does not even suggest the stepped waveform. Embodiment 6 only shows the triangular waveform. Thus, the storage capacitor shown in embodiment 6 cannot voltage-shift a stepped waveform because there is no stepped waveform in embodiment 6. Embodiment 3 only shows a stepped waveform but clearly does not suggest that the stepped voltage waveform is voltage-shifted by a storage capacitor.

In addition, Akimoto fails to suggest the claimed height of the steps in the stepped voltage waveform is greater than the voltage width of the linear operating region of the drive transistor. This is admitted in the Office Action, although it is alleged that this is simply a "discovering of an optimum value of a result" by pointing to In re Boesh.

Applicant respectfully disagrees and points out that In re Boesh involved overlapping ranges. There is nothing in the Akimoto reference which suggests to one skilled in the art any ranges of values. Contrary to the assertions in the Office Action, the third embodiment provides a stepped waveform which is described as the four voltage levels of the 4-level writing signal being set at a medium value between each stepped voltage level of the pixel driving voltage sweep waveform (col. 10). This does not suggest applicant's claimed features and does not lend itself to the application of In re Boesh.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that applicant's claim 1 includes features not found or suggested by Akimoto. Therefore, claim 1 cannot be rendered obvious by Akimoto and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Applicant's independent claim 10 is directed to a method and includes features which were rejected in the Office Action by similar arguments as used in rejecting claim 1. Applicant essentially repeats the above arguments pointing out why claim 10 is likewise not rendered obvious by Akimoto.

Claims 2-3 depend from claim 1 and claims 11-13 depend from claim 10. Each of these dependent claims should also be patentable because they depend from an allowable base claim, and contain further distinguishing features.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-3 and 10-13 under U.S.C. 103(a) is respectfully requested.

### ***Conclusion***

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims pending in this patent application are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of all the claims are respectfully solicited.

In the event there are any errors with respect to the fees for this response or any other papers related to this response, the Director is hereby given permission to charge any shortages and credit any overcharges of any fees required for this submission to Deposit Account No. 14-1270.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian S. Myers/

By: Brian Myers  
Registration No.: 46,947  
For: Larry Liberchuk,  
Registration No.: 40,352

### **Mail all correspondence to:**

Larry Liberchuk, Registration No. 40,352  
US PHILIPS CORPORATION  
P.O. Box 3001  
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001